

REMARKS

The claims previously in the case have been replaced by a set of new claims that are believed to be proper as to form and clearly patentable over the cited references.

Reconsideration is accordingly respectfully requested, for the rejection of the claims as anticipated by or unpatentable over MURAYAMA et al. in view of DE SOUSA or WATKINS further in view of DE SOUSA.

The rejection falls down on MURAYAMA.

New claim 11 now recites that the box (12) contains the control means, whereas in MURAYAMA, the control means (and all the means adapted to download an algorithm) are provided in the computer 401 and not in the device comprising the receptacle.

Thus, MURAYAMA does not disclose a box (12) furnished with a receptacle (14), the receptacle comprising means (16, 22) for storing samples of perfume; and the box (12) comprising the control means (30) as defined in claim 11.

It has to be noted that MURAYAMA discloses the fact that "the portable unit 1401 has an opening 1405 for accepting the memory card 1402 for reading information stored on a magnetic surface and uses the information in generating an aroma" (column 10, lines 7-10). However, MURAYAMA fails to disclose a device comprising means adapted to download an algorithm. Thus, in MURAYAMA, the only device that is adapted to download an

algorithm is the computer 401. Again, it is submitted that claim 11 cannot be interpreted to encompass a computer as in MURAYAMA.

Moreover, one skilled in the art cannot find, in the prior art, any teaching or hint for modifying the disclosure of MURAYAMA as claimed.

In fact, starting from MURAYAMA, one skilled in the art would have maintained the two separate devices (device for diffusing perfumes and computer) and would not have been prompted to integrate means for storing an algorithm within the device for diffusing perfumes.

It should be clearly understood that the claimed invention is a single element comprising the means for diffusing the perfume and the means for storing the algorithm, whereas MURAYAMA discloses two separate devices.

The secondary references may disclose the features for which they were applied; but as none of these overcome the basic deficiencies of MURAYAMA, pointed out above, it is believed that the secondary references need not be discussed in further detail at this time.

As the new claims bring out these distinctions with ample particularity, it is believed that they are all patentable, and reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional
fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



Robert J. Patch, Reg. No. 17,355
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

RJP/lk